

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 9964 of 1996

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE N.N.MATHUR

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

YUNUS NURMOHMAD VADNAGARVALA (CHHIPA)

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

MR RAJNIKANT PATEL for Petitioner

MR MR ANAND, GP WITH MR UA TRIVEDI, AGP for Respondent No. 2

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE N.N.MATHUR

Date of decision: 23/12/96

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. It is well settled that, in order to bring a person within the expression 'dangerous person' as defined in clause (c) of section - 2 of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti Social Activities Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as the PASA Act of 1985), there should be positive materials to indicate that such person is habitual of committing or attempting to commit or

abetting the commission of offences which are punishable under Chapter XVI or XVII of I.P.C. or Chapter V of the Arms Act and that single or isolated act falling under the said Chapters cannot be characterised as a habitual acts as envisaged in section 2(c) of the PASA Act. Further, besides a person being a dangerous person, his activities should also fall within the ambit of expression 'public order'. A distinction has to be drawn between the 'law and order' and 'maintenance of public order.' A reference may be made of Mustakmiya Shaikh v. M.M.Mehta 1995 (2) GLR 1268.

2. No reply to the petition has been filed. However, learned AGP has opposed this petition. Few cases have been registered against the petitioner for the offences under the I.P.C. Some statements were also recorded.

3. I have perused the materials available on record with the assistance of the learned counsel. The statement of the witnesses are of general nature and vague. Considering the material on record, I do not find anything which may indicate that the petitioner is a dangerous person. Thus, in my view, the order of detention is illegal and the same cannot be sustained.

4. In the result, this Special Civil Application is allowed. The impugned order of detention is quashed and set aside. The petitioner - detenu shall be enlarged forthwith, if he is not required in any other case. Rule is made absolute accordingly.

parmar*